



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

h
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,554	04/07/2005	Hiroyuki Sato	10936-86	8861
24256	7590	05/23/2007	EXAMINER	
DINSMORE & SHOHL, LLP			MESH, GENNADIY	
1900 CHEMED CENTER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
255 EAST FIFTH STREET			1711	
CINCINNATI, OH 45202				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/23/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/530,554	SATO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gennadiy Mesh	1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on April 30,2007 is acknowledged.

Rejection is maintained as it was set forth in Office Action mailed on Nov 30,2006, but altered due to amendment of Claim 1 made by the Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 1, 3 - 6 and 13 - 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinoda (US 5,412,067) in view of Howelton (US 5,342,918).

Regarding Claim 1 Shinoda discloses preparation (see abstract) process of polyester with desirable MW(molecular weight) from cyclic esters or their mixtures (see lines 5 –15,column 1), wherein impurities as water and hydroxycarboxylic acids (including oligomers) are accurately controlled (thus proton concentration also controlled) with total amount less than 100 ppm (see abstract, lines 40 – 68,column 2, line 5-7,column 3 and line 50,column 6) in order to produce polyester with desirable MW (see lines 1-5,column 3).

Shinoda is silent about addition of water to polymerization system. However, addition of water in order to start ring-opening polymerization process is known in the art. For example, Howelton teach addition of water (as polymerization initiator) in ring – opening polymerization(see line 20,column1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use purified cyclic ester in order to obtain polyester with desirable MW per teaching of

Shinoda and add water to polymerization system in order to start or/and increase rate of polymerization as it shown by Howelton.

Subject mater claimed by Applicant in Claims 13 – 16 was discussed above.

Also see Shinoda: lines 5-17, column 1; lines 20 – 25, column 6 and Example 6, wherein copolymer of glycolide and other cyclic monomer is disclosed.

Regarding Claims 17 – 20 : Shinoda in view of Howelton discloses substantially same process capable of producing substantially same product as a polyester with same MW. It will be reasonable to believe that other properties as viscosity and Yellowness index will be also substantially same. Burden shits to Applicant provide factual results to the contrary.

3. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinoda (US 5,412,067) in view of Howelton (US 5,342,918) as applied to claims 1-6 and 13 –20 above, and further in view of Early (US 6,437,565).

Regarding Claims 7 – 9: as it shown by Shinoda in view of Howelton that impurities and proton concentration –(see above) are controlled factor in preparation process of the polyester with desirable MW, but silent about regressive correlation between proton concentration and specific physical properties govern by MW of the polymer.

However, regressive analysis is a standard tool, routinely used in the art in order to determine relations between control factors and any functional properties. For example, Early discloses use of regressive analysis (see Fig.4) in order to determine physical properties of the composition.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use regressive analysis as taught by Early in order to find optimum amount of proton concentration in obtain polyester with desirable properties by production method disclosed by Shinoda in view of Howelton.

4. Claims 10 –12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinoda (US 5,412,067) in view of Howelton (US 5,342,918) as applied to claims 1-6 and 13 –20 above, and further in view of Handbook of Thermoplastic Polymers, Chapter 2, pages 80 –94.

Regarding Claim 11 Shinoda in view of Howelton silent about conducting polymerization in closed volume – particularly inside closed tubes.

However, ring –opening polymerization process can be conduct in closed volume, because process is not required evacuation of byproducts from polymerization system due to nature of this process – no volatile byproducts are generated during polymerization process as it disclosed in Handbook of Thermoplastic Polymers, Chapter 2, pages 90 - 94.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to conduct polymerization process disclosed by Shinoda in view of Howelton inside closed tubes (as a simple polymerization reactors), as it claimed by Applicant, due to significant reduction of overall cost of production equipment due to simplicity of this type or reactors(tube).

Regarding Claim 12 Shinoda in view of Howelton silent about conducting polymerization in solid state after initial polymer was produced.

However, solid-state polymerization of polyesters in order to increase MW of the polymer is well known in the art and would be obvious extension of polymerization process as it disclosed in Handbook of Thermoplastic Polymers, Chapter 2, pages 80 – 82.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to conduct polymerization process disclosed by Shinoda in view of Howelton with following step of solid-state polymerization as it thought in Handbook of Thermoplastic Polymers in order to increase MW of the final polymer.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed April 30,2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

5.1. Regarding Applicant's arguments related to Claims 1, 3-6 and 13 - 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinoda (US 5,412,067) in view of Howelton (US 5,342,918):

i) As it was stated in original rejection- Shinoda disclosed process wherein polymer with desirable characteristics is obtained by controlling impurities that contribute to overall proton concentration – thus, first Applicant's argument (see last paragraph, page 9 of Remarks filed on April 30,2007 – further “Remarks”) is not persuasive.

ii). Shinoda as a Primary reference does not need teach all elements of Applicant's Claims 1,3-6and 13-20. Adding water to the polymerization system was taught by Secondary reference as Howelton. Thus, Applicants second argument (see last paragraph on page 9 of Remarks) is not persuasive.

iii) Regarding amount of volatile matter(see Applicant's arguments on page 11, second paragraph of Remarks) – arguments directed to amount of volatile matter is irrelevant to claimed subject matter of Claims 1and 3 – 20.

5.2. Regarding Applicant's arguments related to Claims 7-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinoda (US 5,412,067) in view of Howelton (US 5,342,918) as applied to claims 1-6 and 13 –20 above, and further in view of Early (US 6,437,565).

As it was discussed in original rejection, Shinoda in view of Howelton teach that impurities and proton concentration (see above) are controlled factor in preparation process of the polyester with desirable MW, but silent about regressive correlation between proton concentration and specific physical properties govern by MW of the polymer. Note, that regressive analysis is a standard tool, routinely used in the art in order to determine relations between control factors and any functional properties. For example, Early discloses use of regressive analysis (see Fig.4) in order to determine physical properties of the composition.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use regressive analysis as taught by Early in order to find optimum amount of proton concentration in obtain polyester with desirable properties by production method disclosed by Shinoda in view of Howelton.

5.3. Regarding Applicant's Arguments related to Claims 10-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinoda (US 5,412,067) in view of Howelton

(US 5,342,918) as applied to claims 1-6 and 13 –20 above, and further in view of Handbook of Thermoplastic Polymers, Chapter 2, pages 80 –94:

- i). Regarding Applicant's arguments (see page 17 of Remarks) conducting ring-opening polymerization in closed volume - HTP teach that ring-opening polymerization process can be conduct in closed volume, because process is not required evacuation of byproducts from polymerization system due to nature of this process – no volatile byproducts are generated during polymerization process – it is obvious, **based on this teaching**, to conduct polymerization in closed volume.
- ii) Note, when ring-opening polymerization is completed- all cyclic structures are opened – than low molecular weight polymers can be subjected to SSP (Solid state polymerization) as it routinely done in the art.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gennadiy Mesh whose telephone number is (571) 272 2901. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 a.m - 6 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272 1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gennadiy Mesh
Examiner
Art Unit 1711


James J. Seidleck
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700

On
05/14/07